

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Alexandria Division

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:18-CR-410
)	
SEITU SULAYMAN KOKAYI,)	Honorable Leonie M. Brinkema
)	
Defendant.)	

SEALING ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the United States' request to submit under seal an un-redacted version of the *Government's Response In Opposition To Defendant's Motion for Pretrial Release*. The government's redacted version of this pleading is filed at Dkt. No. 59. For good cause shown, the Court finds:


1. Docket entries 2 and 19 remain filed under seal in this matter.
2. The circumstances of this case involve a minor female witness.
3. The government's response relies upon information in the sealed docket entries and information from the minor witness.
4. Sealing is necessary to comply with the existing sealing orders in this case and to protect the identity of the minor female witness.
5. The Court has considered procedures other than sealing, but none would suffice to protect the information subject to sealing.
6. The Court has the inherent power to seal materials submitted to it. *See United States v. Wuagneux*, 683 F.2d 1343, 1351 (11th Cir. 1982); *State of Arizona v. Maypenny*, 672 F.2d 761, 765 (9th Cir. 1982); *Times Mirror Company v. United States*, 873 F.2d 1210 (9th Cir. 1989); *see also Shea v. Gabriel*, 520 F.2d 879 (1st Cir. 1975); *United States v. Hubbard*, 650

F.2d 293 (D.C. Cir. 1980); *In re Braughton*, 520 F.2d 765, 766 (9th Cir. 1975). “The trial court has supervisory power over its own records and may, in its discretion, seal documents if the public’s right of access is outweighed by competing interests.” *In re Knight Pub. Co.*, 743 F.2d 231, 235 (4th Cir. 1984). Federal officials handling personal information are “bound by the Privacy Act not to disclose any personal information and to take certain precautions to keep personal information confidential.” *Big Ridge, Inc. v. Fed. Mine Safety & Health Review Comm’n*, 715 F.3d 631, 650 (7th Cir. 2013).

7. The United States requests that the un-redacted version of *Government’s Response In Opposition To Defendant’s Motion for Pretrial Release* remain under seal until further Order of the Court.

It is therefore, ORDERED that the United States’ request to submit under seal an un-redacted version of *Government’s Response In Opposition To Defendant’s Motion for Pretrial Release* is GRANTED; it is further ORDERED that the under seal version will remain under seal until further Order of this Court.

ENTERED this 16th day of January, 2019

/s/ 
Leonie M. Brinkema
United States District Judge